# BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

2 IM THE MATTER DF:
5 816 FLAT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
4 Compleinent.
5 Vs.

1

8

7

ė.

9

10

11

12

3.3

14

15

18

27

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

27

28

29

30

50.7

32

ULP-16-1976

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND RECOMMENDED ORDER.

BLAINE CHUNTY, SCHOOL DISTRICT #43
Defendant.

#### STATEMENT OF CASE

On June 17, 1976, the Big Fist Education Association, affiliated with the Montana Education Association, (hereafter referred to as the Association) Filed on unfair labor practice tharge with the Montana Board of Personnel Appeals against Blaine County, School District #43 (hereafter referred to as the School Board).

The charge elleged that the Board of Trustees of Stains County, School District #43 refused to sign a negotiated collective bargaining agreement and refused to execute the contract in violation of Section 59-1685(3), R.C.M., 1947.

The School Board desired the charges in an answer received by the Board of Personnel Appeals on July 7, 1976.

A hearing on the above captioned natter was held on July 30, 1976, in the School Building of Disinc County, School District #43, Turner, Montana. The Association was represented by Ms. Emille Loring of the Tow firm of Filley and Loring, Great Falls, Montana. The School Sound was initially represented by Mr. Wendel Obsecht, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Blaine County, School District #63, Turner, Montana and subsequently represented by Mr. Thomas Boll, Superintendent, Blaine County, School District #63, Turner, Montana.

As the duly appointed bearing exeminer of the Board of Mersonnel Appeals,
Kothryn Walker conducted the hearing in accordance with the provisions of the
Montana Administrative Procedures Act (Sections 82-420) to 82-4225, R.C.M., 1947).

After a thorough review of the entire record of this case, including briefs of parties concerned, Sworn testimony, and evidence, these are the findings:

3

1

5 ď.

4

7

10 3.3

12 13

14 3.5

18 17

18

1.9 20

21

99 23

24

25 28

27

28

29 30

5.3

35.90

 The Association is the exclusive representative for collective hargaining purposes for all teachers imployed by the School Board.

2. In February and March, 1976, the School Board and the Association entered into negotiations for the first collective bargaining agreement between the Association and Biaine County, School District #43.

3. A negotiation session was hald on March 12, 1974 at which a collective hergaining agreement was reached. The agreement was to be retyped, reviewed, and submitted by the School Board for legal advice.

> 6. The minutes of the Barch 12, 1976, meeting, Respondent's Exhibit 1, state: "Contract to be retyped and reviewed by the Board and legal advisor before final adoption."

b. According to the sworm testimony of Wendel Obrecht, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Blaine County, School District #43: "The agreement, the contract that we had tentatively agreed upon, was complete as far as the Board could go, and we were to take It to somehody who knew more about It because it would Jeopardize -- In case there was something in there that would Jeopardize the Board." (tape 252)

c. According to the sworm testimony of Clayton Hornung, President, Big Flat Education Association, ofter the March 12, 1976, negotiation session the Association's negotiating committee reported to the teachers that "negotiations were completed; that the only thing that the Board wanted to do was to take It to legal advice to see if the document was legally sound." (tape 830)

4. On March 13, 1976, the teachers ratified the agreement reached on March 12, 1976, (ratification was based on the Association's report of the agreement; the agreement had not yet been typed).

5. The School Clerk typed the March 12, 1976, agreement between the School Board and the Association.

 The Association's negotiating Lean reviewed the typed March 12, 1976. agreement and returned it to the School Clerk with some correction of typing BETTO COLUMN

7. When individual contracts were issued for the 1976-77 academic year. they tited salaries in accordance with the salary schedule that had been agreed upon on March 12, 1976. The teachers were told that the provision on the individual contracts for seven days sick leave was an error, that they would receive ten days sick leave as had been agreed upon in negotiations.



Doll, who had been bired as Superintendent, Blaine County, School District #63. According to his own sworn testimony, Jack VanYoust, then Chairman, Board of Trustees, Blaine County School District #43, told the teachers that "when the new school board had hired Mr. Doll to be next year's superintendent that we'd ask him to go ahead and read over the negotiations and take it to an attorney-at-law seeing as how he was going to be working with this mester agreement as such," (tape

> b. According to further sworn testimony by Mr. YanYaast: "All through the negotiations there were several times we'd said that we'd like to consult legal advice or a consultant or get some consultation on this thing and seeing as how that you're [fir. Doll] to be hired for the new superintendent we'd talk to you about it because we, I repeat again, that we thought that you'd be working with this thing and you had full right to look at it as such,"

9. A corrected version of the March 12, 1976, agreement, not the March 12, 1576, agreement Itself, was taken by Mr. Doll, representing the School Board, to Mr. Cole, an attorney in Halta, Montena,

Mr. VanVoast's sworn testimony under cross-examination was:

Ms. Loring: "He [Mr. Cole] reject no legal problems regard-

Mr. VanVoast: "Right. That was after the corrected document or after we'd gone through it - it was taken to him [Mr. Cole]... It was a typed agreement, typed by Mr. Doll after some corrections had been made in it..."

Ma. Loring: "... The agreement that was tentatively reached in March, that Mrs. McCracken typed up sometime in April, was that agreement - did you or any other number of the Board ever show that agreement to an attorney?"

Hr. VanVoast: "No. That agramment was given to Hr. Doll... I carlier stated that we wanted consultation. We did not show It to an ettorney ... " (tape 165)

10. A joint session between the teachers and the School Board was held May 28, 1576. According to the minutes of the session (Respondent's Exhibit 2):

"Mr. Dunlop [a member of the Association's negotiating committee] stated that this would not be a negotiating meeting that the teachers fall that it was finished but some of the changes changed the meaning and that the association would not accept this; if it couldn't be signed they would have to file unfair labor practices.

"Mr. Belts [UniServ Director, Region 5, Montana Education Association] stated that basically it was the teachers' feeling between the 2 parties that it was agreed upon and that something had happened to change the board so that It was unfair practices.



30

35.3

32

"Mr. VanVoast stated that we are not lawyers and wanted legal advice. They did not want anything in there that would jeopardize the Board in the future...

"Mr. Belts stated that the Issue here is that the negotiations were finished and had you [had] legal advise [siz] the contract would have been found to be legal.

"Mr. Dahl[sic] stated that tentative agreement is not final."

### DESCUSSION

The unfair labor practice charge brought by the Big Flat Education Association against Blaine County, School District #41 elleges that the School Board refuses to execute the contract as required by Section 59-1605(3), R.C.H., 1947.

It was established in the findings of fact that 1.) the Association and the School Board reached a collective bargaining agreement on March 12, 1976, and 2.) this collective bargaining agreement reached on March 12, 1976, was to be submitted by the School Board to a legal advisor.

The essence of the alleged unfair lator practice is the School Board's Interpretation of these two points and its action pursuant to that interpretation.

 The Association and the School Board reached a collective bargaining Agreement on March 12, 1976.

Throughout sworn testimony and evidence presented, the School Board referred to the March 12, 1976, agreement as the "tentative agreement". That the School Board believed the tentative agreement to still be negotiable is exhibited in Thomas J. Boll's brief to the Board of Personnel Appeals wherein he stated:
"The negotiations between the Soard of Trustees and Dig Flat Magotiation Unit.
as far as the heard is concerned, Here never closed." (sage three)

To clarify the meaning and emphasize the significance of the term "tentative agreement", the relationship of the "tentative agreement" to the "final
agreement" must be clearly understood. In the field of labor relations, these
terms are used to indicate the status of a collective bargaining agreement.
"Tentative agreement" means agreement has been reached at the negotiating table
by and between the duly authorized representatives of the parties involved, but
that the agreement has not yet been formally matified or executed (i.e., has
not yet become the "final agreement").

"Tentative agreement" has been reached when there has been a meeting of the



32

minds by the acceptance of an offer. The agreement is "tentative" only insofer as the agreement has yet to be reduced to writing in its first form, ratified by the union membership and management body, and signed.

Because there has been a mosting of the minds by the acceptance of an offer, the parties that reached the tentative agreement, represented by their duly authorized negotiating teams, are not at liberty to modify the tentative agreement. Clearly, had there been anything repugnant to either party in the offer, there would not have been agreement.

Further substantiating the unalterable nature of the tentative agreement is that good faith bargaining requires the parties to have the authority to bind at the bargaining table. As representatives of the respective parties, the negotiating teams must be able to bargain and to enter into agreement,

After the tentative agreement has been reached, it must be submitted to the union membership and management body for natification. The parties work to accept or reject the tentative agreement in its antirety. If the agreement is ratified (i.e., accepted in its entirety) by both parties it is then executed. If one or both parties fail to ratify the agreement (i.e., reject it in its entirety) the whole agreement is then renegotiable (usually, however, the negotiating teams are given direction as to which provisions are unacceptable and ranegotiate only these provisions).

It is important to note the close relationship between the ratification vote and having the authority to hind at the table. When relatively small bargaining units or management bodies are involved, the negotiating teams may constitute sujorities of the units they represent. These negotiating teams, which presumably have had the authority to hind at the table, are then in positions to swing the ratification votes on the agreement they thousands entered into. Under such directstances, the ratification votes are usually considered little more than necessary formalities.

In conclusion, a collective bargaining agreement was reached on March 12, 1976, between the Association and the School Board. When this tentative agreement was reached accordances were finished, at least until after the ratification votes. The agreement reached on March 12, 1976, was to be submitted to a

legal advisor. If that document was found to be legal, the School Board was to vote on ratification of the contract (the teachers had already ratified the agreement). If the School Board ratified the agreement, the collective bargaining agreement reached on March 12, 1975, was to be executed.

 The collective bargaining agreement reached on March 12, 1976, was to be submitted by the School Board to a Tegal advisor.

This provision was clearly understood and acceptable to both parties. It is assured that execution of the March 12, 1976, agreement was conditional only on the determination of the legality of that agreement.

It was <u>not</u> agreed by both parties that the School board would submit the March 12, 1976, agreement to a person who was not an attorney for his opinion as to the advisability of the agreement's provisions, seek "opinion relating to whather the provisions would jeopardize future school operations" (as stated on page four of Mr. Doll's brief to the Board of Personnel Appeals), or would make unliateral changes in the March 12, 1976, agreement before submitting it to a legal advisor.

It is understandable that the School Board dealed consultation for the negotiation of its first collective bargaining egreement. However, the time for consultation concerning the <u>advisability</u> of certain contract provisions was before or during negotiations, not after agreement had been reached. After agreement had been reached on Barch 12, 1976, it was subject to review only regarding its <u>locality</u>.

In summary, the School Board violated its understanding with the Association by unflaterally changing the March 12, 1976, agreement and submitting an altered document for legal advice. The March 12, 1976, agreement should have been submitted to a legal advisor for a determination of its legality. Mad the March 12, 1976, agreement been decided legal, it should have been executed.

#### CONCLUSION OF LAW

The Respondent violated provisions of Section 55-1605(3), R.C.M., 1947, by refusing to execute a written contract incorporation acreement reached.



1

3

5

6

7 15

10

11

3.2

13

1.5

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

97

28

30

51

32

## RECOMMENDED ORDER

1. Having found that the Hespondent has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the peaning of Section 59-1605(3), R.C.H., 1947, it is ordered that the Respondent cases and desist therefrom and take certain affirmative action designed to effectuate the policies of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action:

a. Expeditiously submit the collective bargaining agreesment reached on March 12, 1976, by and between the Big
Flat Education Association and Elaine County, School
District #43 for review by competent legal advice.

b. If the subjects covered are such that the performance of the contract does not involve a violation of the law, the collective bergaining agreement reached on Harch 12, 1976, by and between the Big Flat Education Association and Blaine County, School District #43 shall be submitted for retification by the management body. Pursuant to retification by the management body, the agreement shall be signed,

c. Notify the Administrator of the Board of Personnel Appeals, in writing, of the steps that have been taken to comply here-with.

BATED this 14th day of October, 1976.

BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

Ketfiryn Walker Hearing Exeminer